

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated March 26, 2008, and is believed to be fully responsive to each point of the rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application of which claims 1, 16, and 18 are independent. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, and 12-18 are amended.

Applicant thanks Examiners Jakovac and Cardone for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives at the personal interview on May 20, 2008. This response constitutes Applicant's written record of the interview.

**OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

In section 1 on page 2, the Office Action objects to the disclosure due to the specified informalities. Specifically, the Office Action lists two grammatical errors in paragraphs [0016] and [0033]. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

Applicant hereby amends the specification in accordance with the proposed amendment discussed at the personal interview on May 20, 2008. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the disclosure.

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

In sections 2-7 on pages 2-3, the Office Action objects to claims 1-2, 6, 10, 13, and 15 due to the specified informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

Applicant hereby amends these claims in accordance with the proposed amendment discussed at the personal interview on May 20, 2008. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

In section 8 on pages 3-4, the Office Action rejects claim 16 as allegedly reciting non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that data structures not claimed as embodied in computer readable media are descriptive matter *per se* and are not statutory. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 16 is hereby amended to recite “a computer-readable storage medium.” As requested at the personal interview, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to paragraph [0013] on page 3 of the specification, which provides support for this subject matter. The tree data structure is stored on a medium to enable modification of VRF tables. Thus, claim 16 now recites statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In section 9 on page 4, the Office Action rejects claim 1 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the specification does not describe how or where generation of an import route target (ImpRT) tree is done. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant hereby amends claim 1 to recite a step of “maintaining an import route target (ImpRT) tree,” in accordance with the proposed amendment discussed at the interview on May 20, 2008. This subject matter finds support in, for example, paragraph [0041] of the specification. This section describes how to maintain a tree that contains a unique set of all import route targets (ImpRT) currently configured on the router. Such trees are also depicted in Figure 3, a drawing that illustrates the relationship between ImpRTs and VRF values.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 11 on pages 5-9, the Office Action rejects claims 1-14, 17, and 18 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0255028 to Chu et al. (hereinafter “Chu”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant responds by adding previously unclaimed subject matter to independent claims 1 and 18. Claim 1 now recites “performing a route refresh operation only if a match is not found” and claim 18 now recites “wherein a route refresh operation is performed only if a match

between a modified ImpRT attribute and an attributed stored in said VRF table is not found.” Support for this subject matter is found in, for example, paragraph [0046] of the specification.

As further described in paragraph [0037], route refreshes are fairly taxing on network bandwidth, especially in a network with a large number of routers and routes. Only the routes that have ExpRT attributes that match the added ImpRT attributes of the new or modified VRF table will be added to the respective router. Thus, as additionally stated in paragraph [0039], no route refreshes will occur when the routes are available locally. A local source of routes will be used to update the VRF table with routes having ImpRTs within its path attributes.

As agreed at the personal interview on May 20, 2008, Chu fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted and described subject matter. Thus, claims 1 and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of Chu's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest this subject matter.

Claims 2-14 are allowable based at least on their dependency from claim 1. Claim 17 is allowable based at least upon its dependency from claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In section 13 on pages 10-12, the Office Action rejects claims 15 and 16 as allegedly unpatentable over Chu in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,838 to Squire et al. (hereinafter “Squire”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent 16 now recites "wherein a route refresh operation is performed only if a match between a modified ImpRT attribute and an attributed stored in said VRF table is not found." As discussed above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 18, Chu fails to disclose, teach, or suggest this subject matter. Furthermore, Squire fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chu detailed above.


Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable at least by virtue of the failure of Chu and Squire to disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted subject matter. Claim 15 is allowable based at least on its dependence from claim 1 for the reasons stated above in connection with the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.**



Terry W. Kramer  
Registration No.: 41,541

Date: June 4, 2008

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.  
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone: 703-519-9801  
Fax: 703-519-9802